



**Suicide Prevention Plan Advisory Committee (SPPAC)
Meeting Highlights**

Doubletree Hotel, 2001 Point West Way, Sacramento, CA 95815
July 12, 2007

Committee Action Items

- Committee members reviewed and provided feedback on the revised draft Plan outline and draft Recommended Actions.
- Sam Bloom provided resource pamphlets. Committee members can contact James Quierolo James.Queirolo@dmh.ca.gov to be added to an email distribution list for articles related to suicide prevention.
- Members should submit comments to DMH on draft PEI resource guide if desired by July 31.
- Members should send any ideas for criteria the committee should use to narrow and refine recommendations to facilitator Deb Marois.
- Committee members should familiarize themselves with the new version of the Plan (forthcoming) before the August meeting.
- Members should contact Orlando Fuentes if they know how to access any of the data being tracked down by the data workgroup. Note: Members do not need to repeat information given via Survey Monkey.
- Members please save the dates September 19 and 21 for participation in one of the stakeholder workshops.

Discussion Highlights

Themes that recurred during discussions included:

- The Plan should be California-specific and include California-specific data.
- The Plan should incorporate the good work of the existing state and national plans.
- Users of the Plan should be able to “see themselves” in the Plan and easily locate the actions that are recommended for people in their position, whether that be as clients, family members, local agencies, state agencies, community-based organizations, etc., keeping in mind that the primary audiences are policy makers, state and local program managers and organizations representing groups of people who would implement the recommended actions
- The Plan should be implementable and be clear about who should do what.
- Members are concerned about how implementation will be funded beyond Proposition 63.
- The Plan needs to encourage collaborative partnerships and nurture grassroots, bottom-up suicide prevention efforts.

MEETING NOTES

Item I: Welcome and Introductions

Committee members, Department of Mental Health (DMH) staff, and consultants introduced themselves. Facilitator Deb Marois reviewed the day's goals, schedule, and ground rules.

Item II: Suicide Prevention Plan Recap and Update

Emily Nahat, Chief, Prevention and Early Intervention Branch (PEI), DMH, welcomed the group. Nahat thanked the committee members for their work at the last meeting and in between meetings, including completing the Survey Monkey SPPAC Member Resource survey. She noted that some members have held local discussion groups since the last meeting; for example, Alfredo Aguirre obtained information about suicide prevention efforts from county mental health directors across the state. Nahat also thanked facilitators and staff, especially Orlando Fuentes for stepping forward to manage the project on behalf of DMH.

SPPAC Communication Technology

Nahat discussed how DMH is responding to member requests to make use of technology and web-based communication during the Advisory Committee process. DMH will continue to use the existing list-serve to communicate with members. The MHSA web page is being used to post notes and agendas, and additional resources may also be posted to the webpage. Members can communicate among themselves using the confidential contact list and can contact Orlando with any needs. Additional options, such as the use of a Google Group, are being researched.

Data Workgroup

Nahat described the formation of a data workgroup including DMH staff and some committee members to review and make recommendations for acquiring information suggested by committee members and other sources. The data workgroup members are: Orlando Fuentes (DMH, PEI Branch), Beverly Whitcomb (DMH, PEI Branch), Sonia Mays (DMH, PEI Branch), Peggy Fish (State Library), Roger Trent, PhD (SPPAC member, DPH), Sharleen Dolan, PsyD (Plan Writer), Patricia Areán, PhD (SPPAC member, UC San Francisco), and Betsy Sheldon (SPPAC member, CA Department of Education). More detail about the workgroup's charge was given as a handout.

Draft PEI Guidelines for Counties

Nahat updated the group on DMH's efforts to distribute draft proposed guidelines to county mental health departments for the first launch of Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI) projects. A draft will be released in mid-July. DMH is holding a conference call for input on Monday July 23. This information is posted on the MHSA

website. Funding guidelines are based on PEI priority populations and key community needs, one of which is suicide prevention.

Nahat requested that committee members give feedback and additional suggestions on the PEI resource document to Fuentes, as soon as possible. Fuentes will also embed relevant suggestions that were given over Survey Monkey. The PEI draft guidelines will be released to the general public on July 16. Nahat informed the group that counties will have an opportunity to do a collaborative community program planning process for how to direct PEI funds. In August, DMH will release information about grant funding available for this planning process.

A member commented that some counties have already made progress on these plans. Counties have already done a collaborative community program planning process for the first component, Community Services and Support, and some comments were made on suicide prevention.

Nahat commented that the SPPAC's work will influence state-administered projects on suicide prevention using MHSA funding. Committee members may be contacted as programs are evaluated.

Nahat reviewed the guidelines for development of the Plan. These guidelines are available as a handout.

Welcome from Dr. Mayberg

Nahat introduced Dr. Stephen Mayberg, Director of DMH. Dr. Mayberg thanked those present and emphasized the importance of the committee's work. He stated that he was impressed with the diversity of experiences and broad spectrum of representation on the SPPAC, including and beyond the mental health community. He noted the SPPAC's ambitious timeline and stressed that the Plan must be California-specific, but it should also be useful as a model for any state. The Plan should be based on practical experiences, research, and outcomes. He concluded by stating that he is very optimistic about the committee's work and is available to respond to ideas.

Committee Member Discussion:

- A member expressed interest in obtaining resources from other state agencies in addition to what DMH and Proposition 63 can contribute. Dr. Mayberg responded that other agencies such as law enforcement, aging, education, and public health, will also participate in implementation, as will counties.
- A member asked Dr. Mayberg to clarify the role of private insurance in paying for suicide prevention treatment. Dr. Mayberg stated that insurance is accessed first if it exists. Philanthropic and volunteer communities have been collaborative and helped to leverage resources. Private insurance may be billed for hospital stays if it is part of the benefits package. Emergency room visits are usually covered by insurance. Dr. Mayberg noted that one great barrier to early intervention is that a person with a history of antidepressants or suicide attempts may be denied

health or life insurance as an individual or family (on the grounds that it is a pre-existing condition). This is an issue in terms of stigma and discrimination.

- A member asked what will happen after May 2008 when the Plan is final. Dr. Mayberg noted that the Plan will be dynamic and have action steps. \$14 million per year for four years are committed for an MHSA state-administered project. An evaluation of economic and human outcomes will help guide the state-administered projects.
- A member voiced concern that there are few direct client representatives on the SPPAC. Dr. Mayberg noted that every member is a spokesperson for a much larger community, and that many have multiple types of experience with suicide prevention.
- A member voiced concern about identifying the discussion of involuntary services as beyond the scope of this project since the Plan is funded by Proposition 63. Dr. Mayberg noted that not all activities are funded by Prop 63 and that the SPPAC has a focused charge.
- A member urged the data committee to think about “whose data is unavailable.” She explained that this focus on “who” is needed from a cultural competency perspective.

Item III: Final Review of Draft Plan Outline

Facilitator Susan Sherry reviewed the memo dated July 6 providing background to the revised plan outline. She noted that there had been little member comment on the way the strategic directions were enumerated, so it seemed that the strategic directions were headed in the right direction. Member comments were incorporated in the revision.

Discussion:

- A member recommended using the word “methods” along with program examples.
- A member asked if there will be an evidence of need and referral to appendix as documentation for each strategic direction. Sherry answered that data will come from committee members and through the data workgroup. The Plan must be user-friendly, but the most relevant data, whether qualitative or quantitative, will be referenced in the report, whether in the text or as an appendix. Compiling the data will be an iterative process and members will have the opportunity to review.
- A member inquired about the mechanism to ensure the recommendations are implemented, for example recommendations about education of law enforcement officers. She stated that she will take an answer by the end of the SPPAC process.
- A member reminded the SPPAC that there are 11 goals in the national plan and state strategy and asked why these were reduced to 5 strategic directions in the SPPAC Plan. Sherry responded that this Plan will be used all over California, not just in the mental health community, and it needs to be user-friendly and media-

friendly. The 11 national and state goals fit under the 5 strategic directions. After discussion, members were comfortable for now with 5 strategic directions.

Plan writer Sharleen Dolan reviewed feedback received from the committee on June 14 and via email, and how these are reflected in the draft. Feedback included:

- Cultural competence should be an overarching principle as well as embedded in each principle.
- There needs to be a place in the Plan for reducing access to lethal means.
- Modifications to language to make clearer or stronger points.
- Many ideas for content of definitions, data, and recommendations.

Dolan noted that draft recommendations in the Plan came from three primary sources: input from last month's SPPAC meeting, reviewing ideas from the application process, and ideas from PEI stakeholder workshops in April. These recommendations were sorted into common themes and topics. The national plan and state strategy also were used as starting points.

Discussion:

- A member commented that "culture" is not the same as race or ethnicity and these terms should not be confused. She will email a suggestion for language to Sharleen.
- A member encouraged methods that assess individual and group risk as a way of targeting suicide prevention efforts.
- A member suggested that a template be developed that shows how national and state goals match up with the strategic directions, highlighting how it relates to California.
- A member suggested using the California Strategy for Suicide Prevention as a resource.
- A member offered to email comments she submitted on July 11 to the SPPAC. She also stressed that the Plan needs to describe more clearly the assessments that people seek out and request.
- A member suggested that the data section should be specific to California, because data varies from state to state. She stressed that the Plan's data should not only focus on those who die, but the hundreds of thousands who have made attempts and demonstrate that they need help.
- A member gave his opinion that by having fewer directions the Plan would sacrifice succinctness. He noted that there is more than one concept embedded in several of the strategic directions, which might be better broken apart.
- A member noted that the skill and conceptual framework of providers should be enhanced. He stated that there is also a need to study patterns and variability in groups to achieve cultural competency. A study should be made of preventable and protective factors as well as settings.
- A member commented that there should be more focus on the underserved and groups that have not been reached.

- A member commented that the Plan needs to use words like “grassroots,” and “bottom-up.” She said the Plan should address how to get families to learn about prevention.
- A member suggested that people need to be able to identify where the Plan applies to them, at the individual level, community level, group level, state and federal levels. She suggested the Plan should clarify who is accountable for doing what with specific goals for state, county, and community level for developing plans.
- A member urged the SPPAC to connect efforts to reality by looking at the data to focus the committee’s efforts.

Facilitators Susan Sherry and Deb Marois led the group in an exercise to generate ideas about opportunities and challenges that may help or hinder suicide prevention. This exercise was intended as an “environmental scan” of the societal context in which the Plan will be released and implemented.

Please note the attachment Opportunities and Challenges.

Item IV and V: Committee Discussion of Suicide Prevention Recommendations

Facilitator Deb Marois explained that the group would split into smaller, self-selected discussion groups. In the first round, members chose one Strategic Direction and discussed Recommended Actions for that Strategic Direction with their small group. Notes from each group were posted around the room. In the second round, members participated in a “gallery walk” by circulating among the posted notes from each group and offering additional comments (“gallery comments”) as they chose to, on any or all of the Recommended Actions from the 5 Strategic Directions.

Notes from each small group and all gallery comments informed the next draft Plan, to be discussed on August 9.

Discussion:

- In general, members expressed concern that the California and National Plans should be incorporated into the SPPAC’s Plan. Staff responded that Sharleen Dolan, the Plan writer, is using the national and state plans as a basis but this committee has an opportunity to both add value and be selective and strategic.
- Members agreed that the committee needs to draw from data as well as experiences. Staff responded that they will continue to bring in data in an iterative process. DMH will also bring in recommendations from OAC and the stakeholder workshops to be held in September.

Item VI: Legislative Update

Nahat introduced Assembly Member Mary Hayashi, the author of AB 509. Hayashi thanked the Governor for creating this body and giving suicide prevention a priority at DMH. She also thanked committee members, Dr. Mayberg, and staff of DMH. Hayashi

explained that AB 509 would create an Office of Suicide Prevention, which California does not currently have. She noted that other states that have such an office have been able to leverage federal funds. Hayashi introduced her Chief of Staff Lara Flynn who can take input on AB 509 (Capitol Office: 916-319-2018 or email lara.flynn@asm.ca.gov) .

Hayashi explained that the bill's intention is to make suicide prevention a visible issue in California and give it a statewide presence. The office could interact with stakeholders, disseminate and collect data, act as a centralized coordinator, and help to implement the Plan. She stated that public testimony made a difference in getting the bill out of the Assembly with an overwhelming majority. The bill is in the State Senate. It passed out of the Senate Health Committee, and Hayashi expects it will go to the Senate floor and the Governor. It is currently in Senate Appropriations, and a hearing is not yet scheduled.

Discussion:

- A member expressed concern that the bill contains no appropriations. Hayashi responded that the bill's proponents have to think about fiscal impact. They are working hard to provide for the Office within existing resources by housing it in DMH. In this budget climate, it is not easy to pull from the General Fund. There is interest in leveraging federal funding. A member commented that perhaps other agencies could contribute.
- A member commented that the LA County Suicide Review Team hopes to bring a bill next year to expand its authority to review cases, for example by reviewing other age groups (not just 18 and younger). This member will discuss the effort with Hayashi's Chief of Staff.
- A member commented that resources have been diverted to certain specialists but not mental health. There is a need to improve the workforce, including a legislative effort to increase training of mental health specialists across disciplines. Hayashi commented that 10% of Proposition 63 is supposed to be used for workforce education and training. Nahat commented that the MHSA Workforce Education and Training Guidelines will soon be going out. These guidelines will include workforce funding for at least the first few years. There is \$100 million for local-initiated programs and \$100 million for state programs to provide training to support the mental health workforce.

Item VII: Resources and Information Needs

Orlando Fuentes gave an overview of the data workgroup's progress. The workgroup examined and categorized data needs submitted by SPPAC members according to ease of availability. It will also consider suggestions submitted in the responses to Survey Monkey. Fuentes referred to the handout which explained the data workgroup's charge and methods. As of the July meeting, data workgroup members were assigned to follow up on data suggestions that need to be researched to determine data availability. Committee members may be able to assist in finding some of this data. The data workgroup will convene on Monday by teleconference to review progress tracking down data, and will also review data from Survey Monkey. Committee members should

let Fuentes know if critical items are missing, or if they know where to find some of the data.

Item VIII: Stakeholder Workshop Planning

Bev Whitcomb, PEI Branch, gave an update on planning for the September stakeholder workshops. DMH is working with the Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) and Sacramento State University Conference Planning to determine logistics for the workshops. September 19 and 21 are the tentative dates.

At the workshops, stakeholders will review the draft plan that results from SPPAC meetings through August. The workshops will be about 3 hours each, probably in the morning. They will likely be held in hotels, one in the San Francisco Bay Area and one in the Los Angeles area. DMH encourages committee members to attend one of the two stakeholder meetings. Whitcomb is checking to see if DMH can provide travel reimbursement. Committee members can actively participate in the workshops by providing background on the SPPAC's work and helping to facilitate round-table discussions. DMH will provide a save-the-date flyer to members so members can provide information to their home organizations and other interested individuals. DMH hopes to create an outreach list beyond "the usual suspects." OAC will have their public comment review reading on September 27 or 28 and also in January.

Discussion:

- A member commented that September 21 is the eve of Yom Kippur, so a workshop would need to be in the morning.
- A member advised not to hold stakeholder workshops on a Friday afternoon in the LA area, in part due to traffic congestion.
- A member requested that DMH draft a letter of invitation instead of just a flyer. DMH responded by offering to do both.
- A member commented that September 19 overlaps the SAMHSA crisis center conference in New Orleans, but agreed that not all conflicts can be avoided.

Item IX: Public Comment

No public comment was offered at the scheduled agenda time, however two members of the public commented earlier in the meeting. Both stressed that the community does not have easy access to resources or knowledge of the law nor where to go when experiencing a mental health emergency such as a suicide attempt. One commented that there is no focus on suicide prevention in schools and asked where it would be appropriate to address this, especially with the lower grades.

Item X: Summary and Next Steps

Members gave their reflections on highlights from the small group discussions. There was general consensus that the small group exercise was very useful. One member commented that if decision-making is based on majority rule, she feels she alone is not able to adequately represent the interests of those she represents (clients). Facilitators Deb Marois and Susan Sherry reviewed how the group makes decisions, based on consensus-seeking but able to forward minority opinions to DMH in the event that consensus is not reached. Final decision-making rests with DMH. Additional input will also be gathered at public stakeholder meetings and the OAC feedback sessions. Emily Nahat (DMH) emphasized that DMH is interested in hearing different voices and honoring different perspectives. She also noted that many SPPAC representatives have been touched by this issue in various ways.

Facilitator Deb Marois reviewed the committee homework:

1. Submit comments on PEI resource guide if desired by July 31. The complete guidelines will be posted July 16.
2. Contribute thoughts on criteria the committee should use to narrow and refine recommendations.
3. Familiarize yourself with the new version of the Plan before you come to the SPPAC meeting in August.

Discussion:

A member asked whether support will be available for committee members who want to host small forums, perhaps in different languages, in their communities or electronically. Staff responded that members should give suggestions about support that would be useful to Orlando Fuentes. DMH staff homework will include determining how to support these efforts.

Members participated in a brief evaluation of the day. Written pros and cons were given to the facilitators to compile. Verbal comments included discussion of the possibility of having a working lunch, which some members wanted in order to increase the time available to the committee, and some did not want due to needing time to take a break. Members agreed that the afternoon process went well, with an hour for deep input and then gallery time to walk around.

The next meeting will be held August 9 at the Radisson Hotel, 500 Leisure Lane, Sacramento, CA 95815.

Adjournment: 5:00 p.m.

ATTENDEES

Committee members

Last	First	Affiliation	
Aguirre	Alfredo	California Mental Health Director's Association	X

Areán, PhD	Patricia	University of California, San Francisco	
Arroyo	Bill	Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health	X
Bateson	John	Contra Costa Crisis Center	X
Bell, PhD	Susan	University of California, Berkeley	X
Bloom	Sam	SPAN-California	X
Boomer	Lisle	Protection and Advocacy, Inc.	X
Bragg	Martin	CA Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo	X
Brody	Delphine	California Network of Mental Health Clients	X
Buck	John	Turning Point Community Programs	
Cawthorn, MFT, MAC	Rick	Hoopa Valley Tribal Council	X
Chaffee	Mark	SPAN-California	
Clayton, M.A.	Diana	NAMI of Shasta County	X
Cory	Carole	California Department of Aging	X
Craig	Rebecca	Dept. of Corrections & Rehabilitation	X
Curren	Joe	Redwood Coast Senior, Inc.	X
Curry, PhD	Kita	CCCMHA & Didi Hirsch Community Mental Health Center	X
Fetrow	Steven	California National Guard, Headquarters (Major Eric Frye, Social Work Officer)	x
Garcia	Leticia	Senator Alan Lowenthal, 27th Senate District	
Garcia	Luis	California Mental Health Planning Council	X
Gaw, MD, DLFAPA	Albert	SF DPH CMHS (Community Mental Health Services)	X
Gorewitz, PhD	Janet	Martinez Detention Facility	X
Gouveia	Leann	Fresno Survivors of Suicide Loss	X
Hayashi	Mary	Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission	X
Lawson III	Morris		
Lee	Tom	Department of Social Services	X
Locario	Seprieono	Native American Health Center	X
Mays, PhD, MSPH	Vickie	University of California, Los Angeles	X
Morales	Ed	Dept. of Corrections & Rehabilitation -Division of Juvenile Justice	X
Pena	Maria	Mira Costa College Disabled Student Programs and Services	X
Pines, Ph.D.	Michael	Los Angeles County Office of Education, School of Mental Health	X
Ranahan	Dede	National Alliance of Mental Illness, California	X
Robbins, CFRE	Charles	The Trevor Project, Administrative Offices	
Russell	Mindy	Law Enforcement Chaplaincy Sacramento	
Selix	Rusty	California Council of Community Mental Health Agencies	
Sheldon	Betsy	California Department of Education	X
Steele	Clyde	Office of Co-Occurring Disorders	X
Trent, PhD	Roger	CA Department of Health Services, Epidemiology & Prevention for Injury Control	X
Willson	Billee	Sacramento County Department of Health and Human Services	X
Yee, PhD	Tina Tong	SF Community Behavioral Services	X

Project Staff

Department of Mental Health: Emily Nahat, Orlando Fuentes, Bev Whitcomb, Sonia Mays
CSUS Center for Collaborative Policy: Deb Marois, Susan Sherry, Laura Kaplan
Consultant/Writer: Sharleen Dolan
State Library: Peggy Fish.

DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE

- Agenda

- Goals for 7/12 SPPAC meeting
- Notes from 6/14 SPPAC meeting
- Guidelines for development of the Plan
- Cover letter to SPPAC for 7/12 meeting
- Revised Plan outline
- Round table discussion summary from 6/14
- Draft Plan recommendations
- SPPAC resource survey results
- Data workgroup charge
- SPPAC contact list
- Member biographies
- Original Plan outline